## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejection presented in the Office Action dated July 25, 2008, (hereinafter Office Action) has been considered, and reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

In an effort to facilitate prosecution and without acquiescing to characterizations of the asserted art, Applicant's claimed subject matter, or to the applications of the asserted art or combinations thereof to Applicant's claimed subject matter, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 to include the limitations of dependent Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, and 16, and to characterize that a connection is established with a user terminal. Dependent Claims 9 and 13 have also been amended to provide consistency with the changes to the independent claims. Since these changes merely introduce dependent claim limitations to the independent claims, the changes do not introduce new matter. However, further support may be found in paragraphs [0029] and [0036] of the Specification. Each of the pending claims is believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth below.

Mansikkaniemi at least has not been shown to teach a terminal that associates one or more calendar notes with calendar profiles, as claimed in each of the independent claims. Mansikkaniemi teaches that when a user enters a new event into the user's individual calendar, the event may also be designated to be listed on a shared (family) calendar. There is no teaching or suggestion that the terminal receiving the entry makes this designation (asserted as corresponding to the claimed associating of notes with profiles). In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to an apparatus that associates calendar notes with calendar profiles (see, e.g., paragraph [0032]). Without correspondence to each of the claim limitations, the § 102(b) rejection is improper, and Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 4, 8, 9, and 13 depend from independent Claims 1, 5, and 10, respectively, and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Mansikkaniemi. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, these rejections are also improper for the reasons discussed above

in connection with independent Claims 1, 5, and 10. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited reference. Therefore, the rejection of dependent Claims 4, 8, 9, and 13 is improper, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With particular respect to the rejection of dependent Claims 4 and 8, Applicant traverses because Mansikkaniemi has not been shown to teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations. The cited portions of Mansikkaniemi do not teach that shared content is generated based on a remote device, user group, purpose of use or time of day. Rather, Mansikkaniemi teaches that shared content is generated based on a designation of an event by a user. The fact that a day view or month arrangement may be displayed fails to correspond to the claimed generation of shared content on the basis of a time of day. Without correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the § 102(b) rejection is improper, and Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, Claim 17 has been added. Support for this claim may be found in original Claim 10; therefore, the claim does not introduce new matter. This claim is also believed to be patentable over the asserted references for the reasons set forth above in connection with the independent claims.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (KOL.217.WUS) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC 8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125 Minneapolis, MN 55425 952.854.2700

Date: January 12, 2009 By: /Erin M. Nichols/

Erin M. Nichols Reg. No. 57,125